IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR, CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1092 / 2003

PETITIONER : Kailash Nath Sahu
s/o Shri Kamdev Sahu
aged 35 years ,Occupation
Part Time Sweeper in
Veterinary Department,
r/o Alebelapara ,Kanker,
Distt. Kanker ,Chhattisgarh

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :
1. State of Chhattisgarh
through the Secretary,
Department of Veterinary
Services ,D.K.S. Bhawan
Raipur ,C.G.
2. The Collector
Kanker,
Kanker,Chhattisgarh
3. The Director,
Veterinary Services,
G.E. Road, Raipur,C.G.
4. The Deputy Director ,
Veterinary Services,
Albelapara ,Civil Line
Kanker,Distt. Kanker, C.G.
5. The Chief Executive
Officer, Jila Panchyat
Kanker ,Beside kutchery,
Distt. Kanker ,Chhattisgarh

P. R. No. 715/03
Presented by Shri F.S. Khare
dated 05.03.03

RECEIVED COPY
5/3/03
CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, CERTIORARI AND ANY OTHER WRITS,DIRECTIONS OR ORDERS.

KI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(33)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.NO.1092/2003 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

07/05/2004

Shri Satyendra Sahu, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents no. 1 to 4.

Shri Prateek Sinha, counsel for respondent no.5.

The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India questioning the order dated 19/02/2003 passed by the Deputy Director, Veterinary Services, Kanker, District Kanker (Annexure P/1) whereby the show cause notice was issued to the petitioner for terminating his services.

The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed on 04/11/1999 by respondent no.4 as Part Time Sweeper in Veterinary hospitals of Puri, Block Office Charama, District Kanker C.G on monthly basis and thereafter on 19/02/2003 respondent no.4 issued show cause notice. Petitioner was working with sincerity, devotion and honest and he has worked more than four years as such he was expecting regularization. He also received a letter from respondent no.4 on 23/07/2002 (Annexure P/3) and he was drawing salary of Rs.941/- per month. However, later on, respondent no.4 terminated the services of petitioner vide order dated 04/03/2003. Petitioner made a representation, but the same was not considered.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that in the circumstances, the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(34)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

respondent no.4 for considering his representation to which learned counsel for the respondents have no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances to respondent no.4 within a period of ten days from today and in turn respondent no. 4 shall decide the representation within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the representation considering all the grievances raised by the petitioner in an objective manner by passing a reasoned order in accordance with law.

With the aforesaid observations and directions the petition stands disposed of.

Consequently, M.W.P.No. 3043/2003 and I.A.No. 730/2004 also stand disposed of.

Certified copy as per Rules.

Sd/-
L.C. Bhadoo
Judge